

**REMARKS**

After the foregoing amendment, claims 1-35 have been canceled. Pending claims 4-6, 8-16 and 18-35 have been renumbered as new claims 36-65. New independent claim 36 has been amended with respect to claim 21 and support for the amendment is found at pages 31-36 and Figs. 28-31. New claim 51 replacing claim 22 is unamended. Claims 66-71 have been added. New claims 66-71 find support at pages 37-45 of the application. Accordingly, Applicant submits that no new matter has been added to the application by the Amendment.

**Claim Objections**

The Examiner objected to claims 4-6, 8-16 and 18-35 because of the informalities. Applicant has renumbered claims 4-6, 8-16 and 18-35 to place claims depending from an independent claims in numerical order from the corresponding independent claim. The following chart relates the old claim numbering to the new claim numbering. The new independent claims 36, 51, 66 and 67 are shown in bold.

New Claim Number	Old claim Number
<b>36</b>	<b>21</b>
37	4
38	8
39	9
40	10
41	11
42	12
43	13
44	14
45	15
46	16
47	18
48	19
49	20
50	26
<b>51</b>	<b>22</b>
52	5
53	6
54	23
55	24
56	25

57	27
58	28
59	29
60	30
61	31
62	32
63	33
64	34
65	35
<b>66</b>	<b>new</b>
<b>67</b>	<b>new</b>
68	new
69	new
70	new
71	new

### Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 8-16, 18, and 21 corresponding to renumbered claims 36-47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0036793 to Roosen *et al.* ("Roosen") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0046238 to Estavillo *et al.* ("Estavillo").

Claim 36 replaces claim 21 and is amended as follows:

36. (New) *A printing apparatus comprising:*  
*a receiving unit which receives data from a host;*  
*a transmitting unit which transmits data to the host;*  
*a print unit which prints print data onto a medium;*  
*an analyzing unit which analyzes the data received from said host;*  
*a storing unit which stores said print data if a result of said analysis*  
*indicates that the data is print data;*  
*a list forming unit which forms a list of the print data stored in said*  
*storing unit and outputs said list of the print data to said transmitting unit if the*

*result of said analysis by said analyzing unit indicates that the received data is inquiry data;*

*a print instructing unit which, if the result of said analysis by said analyzing unit indicates that the received data is print instruction data and information of another external apparatus is included in the print instruction data, transfers the print data to another external apparatus whereupon the print data is directly printed, and if the information about the another external apparatus is not included in the print instruction data, outputs said print data stored in said storing unit to said print unit whereupon the print data is printed by the printing apparatus.*

As pointed out by the Examiner, Roosen provides a user with a display for transferring a print job from one printer to another printer. As discussed in paragraph [0108] button 56 allows the user to issue a first type of print instruction which transfers a pending print job from one printer to another printer where it is stored, and a second button 57 which allows the user to start the printing process for the print job stored in the other printer.

Claim 21 rewritten as claim 36 recites transferring and directly printing the pending job in another external device. Thus, in contrast to Roosen, an operator selecting to print the print job in another printer need only to issue the print instruction to transfer the print job to another printer in order to print the print job and does not then need to send an additional command in order to print the transferred print job.

Roosen does not disclose, teach or suggest a single print instruction which transfers and prints a print job in another external device, as recited in new claim 36. Also, Estavillo does not disclose, teach or suggest an operation of transferring and printing a print job by a single print instruction and therefore does not make up for the deficiencies of Roosen. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 21 as it may be applied to new claim 36.

Claims 37-47, corresponding to claims 4, 8-16 and 18, depend from claim 36. Accordingly, claims 37-47 are allowable based at least on their dependency from allowable claim 36.

**Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 19 and 20 as under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roosen, as modified by Estavillo, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0138564 to Treptow *et al.* ("Treptow").

Claims 19 and 20 have been rewritten as new claims 48 and 49 depending from claim 36. Treptow does not disclose, teach or suggest an operation of transferring and printing a print job by a single print instruction and therefore does not make up for the deficiencies Roosen and Estavillo. Accordingly, claims 48 and 49 are allowable based at least on their dependency from allowable claim 36.

**Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claim 26 as under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roosen, as modified by Estavillo, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,812,747 to Kayano *et al.* ("Kayano").

Claim 26 has been rewritten as new claim 50 depending from claim 36. Kayano does not disclose, teach or suggest an operation of transferring and printing a print job by a single print instruction and therefore does not make up for the deficiencies Roosen and Estavillo. Accordingly, claim 50 is allowable based at least on its dependency from allowable claim 36.

**Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 22, 23 and 27-35 as under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roosen in view of Estavillo and U.S. Patent No. 6,616,359 to Nakagiri *et al.* ("Nakagiri").

Claims 5, 22, 23 and 27-35 have been rewritten as new claims 51, 52, 54 and 57-65.

New independent claim 51, replacing independent claim 22 without amendment, recites:

51. *(New) A printing apparatus comprising:*  
*a receiving unit which receives data from a host;*  
*a transmitting unit which transmits data to the host;*  
*a print unit which prints print data onto a medium;*  
*an analyzing unit which analyzes the data received from said host;*  
*a storing unit which stores said print data if a result of said analysis*  
*indicates that the data is print data;*  
*a list forming unit which forms a list of the print data stored in said*  
*storing unit and outputs said list of the print data to said transmitting unit if the*  
*result of said analysis indicates inquiry data;*  
*a print instructing unit, which if the result of said analysis indicates print*  
*instruction data, outputs said print data stored in said storing unit to said print*  
*unit on a basis of said print instruction data; and*  
*a converting unit which converts a portion of said print data it into an*  
*image data format in which the print data can be displayed by said host, the*  
*image data being stored into the storing unit in an interlocking relation with said*  
*print data and the transmitting unit transmitting the image data if said inquiry*  
*data is received, wherein the print data of only the first page is converted, the first*  
*page being a first sheet in plural sheets.*

In rejecting claim 22, now claim 51, the Examiner admits that Roosen does not teach a converting unit and that neither Roosen nor Estavillo teach converting the first page in plural sheets, but that Nakagiri teaches converting the first page, the first page being the first sheet in plural sheets . Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicants submit that Nakagiri clearly discloses at, for example col. 7 lines 52-54 that “the previewer 306 ....is instructed to execute a preview process of a job”. Nakagiri continues at col. 7, line 57- 64 to describe that the previewer reads out the PDF files of intermediate codes included in the spool file 303. Thus, it is clear that Nakagiri

converts an entire spool file when a print preview process is selected and not “only the first page being a first sheet in plural sheets” as recited in claim 51.

Claim 51 recites that only the first page of plural sheets is converted into an image data format. The mere fact that the user can choose to display only a single selected page for preview does not change the fact that Nakagiri converts all of the pages of the job including when the job consists of plural sheets, thus expending additional time for providing a preview to a user and requiring more processing power in comparison to the present invention.

Applicant submits that the combination of Roosen, Estavillo and Nakagiri does not teach, suggest or disclose all the elements of claim 51. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 22 as applied to new claim 51.

Claims 5, 23 and 27-35, renumbered as new claims 52, 54 and 57-65 depend from allowable claim 51. Accordingly, claims 52, 54 and 57-65 are allowable at least based on their dependency from allowable claim 51.

### **Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 24 and 25 as under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roosen, as modified by Estavillo and Nakagiri, and further in view of Treptow.

Claims 24 and 25 have been rewritten as new claims 55 and 56 depending from claim 51. Treptow does not disclose, teach or suggest converting the print data of only a first page of a plurality of pages to image data and therefore does not make up for the deficiencies Roosen, Estavillo and Nakagiri. Accordingly, claims 55 and 56 are allowable based at least on its dependency from allowable claim 51.

### **Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claim 6 as under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roosen, as modified by Estavillo and Nakagiri, and further in view of Kayano.

Kayano does not disclose, teach or suggest converting the print data of only a first page of a plurality of pages to image data and therefore does not make up for the deficiencies Roosen, Estavillo and Nakagiri. Accordingly, claim 6 is allowable based at least on its dependency from allowable claim 51.

### **New Claims 66-71**

New claim 66 recites:

66. *A system comprising:*  
*a host;*  
*a printing apparatus; and*  
*a plurality of external apparatus, wherein the host has a transfer designation section configured to designate a transfer destination apparatus from the plurality of external apparatus and to attach transfer information including an address of the designated transfer destination apparatus to print instruction data and a transmission section which is configured to transmit the print instruction data to the printing apparatus.*

Neither Roosen, Estavillo, Nakagiri, Kayano or Treptow disclose a host having a transfer designation section configured to: (1) designate a transfer destination apparatus from the plurality of external apparatus and (2) to attach transfer information including the address of the designated transfer destination apparatus to the print instruction data. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of new claim 66.

New claim 67 recites:

67. *A system comprising:*

*a host;*  
*a transfer source apparatus; and*  
*at least one transfer destination apparatus,*  
*wherein the host is configured to send a transfer instruction*  
*command to the transfer source apparatus for instructing the transfer source*  
*apparatus to transfer a print job to the at least one transfer destination*  
*apparatus, and to further send the transfer instruction command to the transfer*  
*destination apparatus,*  
*wherein, the transfer destination apparatus is configured to send*  
*reception confirmation information to the transfer source apparatus after*  
*receiving the transfer instruction command from the host, and*  
*wherein the transfer source apparatus is configured to start*  
*transferring the print job to the transfer destination apparatus after receiving the*  
*reception confirmation information from the transfer destination apparatus.*

Neither Roosen, Estavillo, Nakagiri, Kayano or Treptow disclose the transfer protocol recited in new claim 67. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of new claim 67.

Claims 68-71 are allowable based at least on their dependency from allowable claim 67.



**Conclusion**

Insofar as the Examiner's objections and rejections have been fully addressed, the instant application, including claims 4-6, 8-16 and 18-35 renumbered as claims 36-65 and new claims 66-77 is in condition for allowance and Notice of Allowability of all pending claims is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**Osamu IZAKI**

April 15, 2009  
(Date)

By: 

**LOUIS SICKLES II**

Registration No. 45,803

**PANITCH SCHWARZE BELISARIO & NADEL LLP**

One Commerce Square

2005 Market Street, Suite 2200

Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013

Telephone: 215-965-1330

**Direct Dial: 215-965-1294**

Facsimile: 215-965-1331

E-Mail: lsickles@panitchlaw.com

LS/msm